Tells the Facts and Names the Names

$2.50

CounterPunch

March 1-15, 2003 *Alexander Cockburn and Jeffrey St. Clair* VOL. 10, NO. 5

Our Little Secrets

This Just In from Oregon

Dear Honorable Representative Conyers,

As a Commissioner at the Tualatin Valley Water District I know how hard our engineers and staff work to provide clean drinking water for our community. I was appalled to discover that chlorine, aluminum sulfate and many spare parts for treatment facilities have been banned under the Iraqi sanctions. I can't imagine what it must be like to work under those conditions.

Then I found out about "Shock and Awe." Harlan Ullman, the architect of the campaign, admitted to CBS news that the plan is to "take out their water and power." Now the Pentagon is claiming not to target civilian infrastructure, but the cat's out of the bag.

I will vociferously support any attempt to impeach this rogue President, in the memory of all those who have died and are yet to die from water-borne illnesses in the war torn nation of Iraq.

Sincerely,
Lisa Melyan
Commissioner
Tualatin Valley Water District
Portland OR

And This Just In From Texas

"Where did this idea come from that everybody deserves free education, free medical care, free whatever? It comes from Moscow, from Russia.

(**OLS** *continued on page 2*)

Labor's Historic No to Bush's War on Iraq

BY JOANN WYPIJEWSKI

In hundreds of resolutions, composed with caution or with ire, institutional labor has declared itself opposed to the President's war on Iraq. It has done nothing of the kind since before World War I. It has numerous reasons for doing so now, but in one of those perverse twists that propel history, it has been able to do it mainly because it is weak.

Labor is weak in the precincts of power that accepted or at least tolerated its participation during World War II, Korea and Vietnam. More than weak in the councils of Bush who, since coming to office in 2001, has not even returned John Sweeney's phone calls. As a longtime union radical put it, "In the new unilateralist structure, labor is not a junior partner; it's not an associate junior partner. On a good day-a good day-it's a temp."

In any other context labor's antiwar sentiment might be notable for emotion, possibly analytical rigor. But in any other context it would also be confined to the left of labor, which has always raised the flag of resistance, sometimes belatedly, certainly fragmentedly, and which was the first to decry the twin threats of war abroad and at home in the wake of September 11.

The AFL-CIO Executive Council's February 27 resolution on Iraq, on the other hand, is a fundamentally conservative document. From its opening lines, "America's working families and their unions fully support the efforts to disarm the dictatorial regime of Saddam Hussein. This is best achieved in concert with a broad international coalition of allies and with the sanction of the United Nations", it suggests that the federation's leaders might like to imagine themselves latter-day Wise Men, those elder statesmen who historically advocated a high-minded diplomacy while defending America's absolute prerogatives for violence.

Yet they have no more chance of playing that role than the real Wise Men have of rematerializing center-stage. No sooner had the resolution been issued than the headlines placed the AFL-CIO in the antiwar column. Activists seized on one sentence and ignored the rest: "The president has not fulfilled his responsibility to make a compelling and coherent explanation to the American people and the world about the need for military action against Iraq at this time."

Editorialists at The Wall Street Journal did the same, excoriating Sweeney for dropping the blood-drenched standard borne by the "genuine Cold War heroes" who preceded him in the job, and pronouncing that "on Iraq he has aligned the patriotic U.S. labor movement with France, Russia and Al Sharpton."

The duality here, of an AFL-CIO appeal pitched to the ear of power but heard in any meaningful way only by the broader public of which union members are a part-symbolizes the historic significance of the present moment more than all the words on all the resolutions that have been or might yet be written. If it wasn't already clear before the 2000 elections it is now that institutional labor, for decades part of

(**labor** *continued on page 3)*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our Little Secrets

It comes straight out of the pit of hell."

— Texas State Rep. Debbie Riddle, Republican (Houston), member of the House Border Affairs Committee

Rubin To Rich to...

By Kenneth Rapoza

Who exactly is Barry Rubin, whose name weaves in and out of stories about the Israel-related pro-war lobby in Washington? Prof. Rubin is director of the GLORIA [Global Research in International Affairs] Center in Herzliya, and publisher (and founder) of the Middle East Review of International Affairs, which last September ran the Ibrahim al Marashi piece that took up 11 of the 19 pages in Tony Blair's "smoking gun" dossier.

On Feb 4, Prof. Rubin took part in a press event run by Eleana Benador at the Willard Hotel in Washington DC. Benador is the PR agent for nearly all the right wing media pundits whose ties to the US foreign policy establishment were disclosed by Brian Whitaker of the Guardian last year. The Benador event included Richard Perle (co-author of the now infamous "Clean Break" strategy), Frank Gaffney Jr. (who wrote in a Washington Times story this year that Islamicists have taken over Washington), Michael Ledeen (columnist openly in favor of removing Palestinians from the territories) and Prof. Rubin. A colleague of mine in attendance told me that Rubin said the overthrow of Hussein by US military action would usher in the third great revolution in the Middle East, after Ayatollah Khomeini's rise in 1979 Iran, and Gamal Abdel-Nasser's in 1950s Egypt, when Hussein coming on deck.

Benador is a fairly open book. She says that her work is more than a job, "it's a mission." Her sentiments mirror the Bush Administration's. Given her list of experts, we know why. Here is a sample of her reasoning: "I've spoken with top psychologists in Iraq who have children in school with Saddam's children and one day Saddam's kids came out all happy from school because their dad had fired their housekeeper. Look at this man. We want a leader like that with weapons of mass destruction?" Benador's professional bio has her listed as a former editor at the Peruvian Times in Lima. She was an editorial assistant there, decades ago, for 6 months.

Rubin's contributors largely write about Islamic terrorism and how it is rampant the world over. He is also the editor of the Turkish Studies journal. His latest endeavor is a GLORIA Center program called The Real Middle East. He also runs the U.S. Foreign Policy Project at GLORIA. The Lynne and Harry Bradley Foundation is funding a study on anti-Americanism there. He has written widely on the Israel-Palestine conflict, has written about North Korea as a threat to Israel and the Middle East in general, and has written articles on globalization and how it is fiercely resisted by Arab nationalism and is likely to continue to be challenged in the region.

Rubinis is a supporter of Ariel Sharon, and no fan of Labor's Amram Mitzna, whom he criticized in a Wall Street Journal op-ed as essentially an appeaser of terrorists. What is less known is that the academic institutions he works for have a cast of unsavory characters.

He is a senior faculty member at the Lauder School of Government, Policy and Diplomacy, for instance. The School is named after American CEO and diplomat Ronald Lauder, billion-dollar heir to the Esteé Lauder fortune and a financier to Sharon and Benjamin Netanyahu. Lauder attended a demonstration of 450,000 protestors (Lauder's estimate in press release) on Jan 8, 2001 in Jerusalem against Ehud Barak's peace efforts in the city. Lauder was a speaker at the event, along with some of Israel's more fanatical, Messianic "Temple Mount" crowd. He spoke two days later on the same topic in New York City.

Rubin is also a senior fellow at the International Center for Counterterrorist Policy in Herzliya. ICT has ties to yet another billionaire. This time it's the fugitive Marc Rich. Rich made the mainstream media recently when Bill Clinton told Katie Couric on the Today Show in early February that he was sorry he pardoned the guy. Rich is a regular in Israel, giving conferences, throwing his money around to organizations where Rubin works. Avner Azuley is listed as trustee at ICT and managing director of Marc Rich's The Rich Foundation located in Switzerland. Lewis Libby, Marc Rich's former lawyer, is now Dick Cheney's right hand man.

Kenneth Rapoza is a freelance journalist in Massachusetts.

What's Next?

Now that the US is actually attacking Iraq, how much stamina has this new peace movement got? Back in January, 1991, the peace movement pretty much folded its tents as soon as the US missiles started dropping on Baghdad. Here we are in March, 2003. Will it be the same?

Yes, it could all get a lot tougher. The protesters will get accused of stabbing the troops in the back, of being disloyal to the flag. It could get worse still, with Attorney General Ashcroft and the Justice Department summoning up powers vouchsafed them under the Patriot Act to harass or shut down peace organizations, hit them with conspiracy indictments and so forth. As things are, a lot of people on the streets or holding candles think that under Bush and Ashcroft the Bill of rights is on the Endangered species list. There's a real edge of nervousness.

If the battle lines harden some of middle America now going to vigils, or marching in their local town could draw back. But to get a measure of how disaffected a

(**OLS** *continued on page 3)*

Editors
Alexander Cockburn
Jeffrey St. Clair

Business Manager
Becky Grant

Design
Deborah Thomas

Counselor
Ben Sonnenberg

Published twice monthly except August, 22 issues a year:
$40 individuals,
$100 institutions/supporters
$30 student/low-income
CounterPunch.
All rights reserved.
CounterPunch
PO Box 228
Petrolia, CA 95558
1-800-840-3683 (phone)
counterpunch@counterpunch.org
www.counterpunch.org

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(**Labor** *continued from page 1*)

the machinery that brokered consent, distributed benefits and blunted the edge of radical resistance in America, has been kicked out of the ruling coalition. The ascension of George Bush was not the cause but merely the completion of a process that began with the falling rate of profit in the 1970s, continued with the Reaganite rejection of union rights as a legitimate feature of business, and climaxed with the Democratic Leadership Council's capture of the Democratic Party, its repudiation of the New Deal and implementation of the Clinton doctrine, (what one high-level labor official called "fucking your friends and rewarding your enemies.")

With Bush the last shreds of pretense have dropped. Smoke from the World Trade Center was still choking New Yorkers when Washington tailored the war on terror to fit an assault on workers as well. In those earliest days, House majority leader Dick Armey rejected including emergency relief for airline and aviation workers in the airline bailout package, saying it was "not commensurate with the American spirit." Urged on by their Republican governor to "defend freedom," the people of Oklahoma surged to the polls to approve a "right to work" ballot initiative. Supporters of fast-track trade authorization equated it with the fight against terror, and won.

Then came the mass firing of immigrant baggage screeners, the derailment of immigration reform, the rising unemployment and depleted benefits, the tax cuts for the rich, the Patriot Act's betrayal of the Constitution, the promise to privatize 850,000 government jobs, the imposition of Taft-Hartley restraints against the International Longshore and Warehouse Union, the threat to strip dock workers permanently of the right to strike, and the elimination of collective bargaining rights for civil servants in the Office of Homeland Security, a declaration that union membership is inimical to the common good.

attempted to fully support an anti-worker President's War on Terrorism while fighting the effects of the War on our members. [I]t is a losing strategy.To support the War is to invite all the inevitable political and economic effects."

By then, labor organizations opposed to the president's permanent war policy had been in existence for more than a year in New York, San Francisco and Washington. As a result of their work or independently, antiwar caucuses had sprung up in major and not-so-major unions, and it seemed that every week brought a new resolution from somewhere, though not at the national level.

At a conference held in late October by New York City Labor Against the War, Bruskin and others started talking about linking the disparate forces. Separately, Bob Muehlenkamp, a longtime organizer and union campaign strategist, had been talking with activists looking for a vehicle to encourage their Internationals to take a stand. These conversations intersected,

A resolution which enunciates simple principles of national and global working-class interest and opposition to war on Iraq, was circulated and endorsed by 250 unions in fifty-five countries representing 150 million workers.

Many in organized labor, perhaps most in the leadership, still express fealty to the president in the war on terrorism, separating out the war on Iraq as a special case. Yet increasingly trade unionists have identified militarism, repression and austerity as prongs of a single policy. Gene Bruskin, secretary-treasurer of the Food and Allied Services Trade Department of the AFL, made that case last October in a letter to Sweeney which, once circulated, resonated widely.

"[Bush's] War of Terror and War on Iraq," Bruskin wrote, "have little to do with promoting security for the US citizenry. Rather, his foreign policy is designed to serve the same corporate interests that drive his domestic policy, making the world safe for US multinationals.

"Labor has been clear and vocal about the dangers of Bush's domestic policies, but we have been naïve at best about the objectives of his foreign policy. We have

and on January 11, 2003, at Teamsters Local 705 in Chicago, about 100 union antiwar advocates from across the country gathered to initiate US Labor Against the War.

Two days later the AFL's International Affairs Committee met for a briefing on the question of Iraq. To say the least, the federation, including most of the International presidents, were reluctant to stake a position on the war. Institutionally it is allergic to controversy. Polls results were complicated, indicating that unionists, like most Americans, had rather spongy opinions and sometimes disapproved of their union taking a stand even when they themselves opposed the war.

But while the members may have been polling one way, they were showing another way. By the time the Executive Council met in February, about 30 percent of organized labor had declared itself in some fashion against Bush's war on Iraq.

(**OLS** *continued from page 2)*

lot of blue collar opinion is, never forget that for the first time, the AFL-CIO has condemned one of America's wars.

What people are missing here is the breadth of a new political culture of opposition, truly a worldwide movement. Many people, particularly young politically active people don't get their info any more just from local newspapers of CNN or the other networks. They have the internet, and so they can read Robin Cook's resignation speech on Monday, eyewitness accounts of Rachel Corrie's death on Tuesday, three eyewitness accounts from Baghdad on Wednesday.

There's another irony. Precisely because the Democrats has been, at least until the last few days, largely so feeble about the war, the antiwar movement is catchment for a larger discontent with the Bush administration, for Enron, for the tax cuts for the rich, the onslaught on the environment.

We have a huge movement, a new generation of young people inducted into the fun, boredom, fear, exhilaration and experience of popular protest. It was that movement, here and across the world that frightened Bush out of the Security Council and into the lawless cliches of a Hollywood Western. That movement's been around since Seattle and it's not going away.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Each Central Labor Council and State Federation resolution had been cc'd to Washington. After the formation of USLAW, the Postal Workers, the Communications Workers, the Farm Workers, SEIU and UNITE all went on record. Shortly before, AFSCME had come out against unilateralism.

An international version of the USLAW resolution, which enunciates simple principles of national and global working-class interest and opposition to war on Iraq, was circulated and endorsed by 250 unions in fifty-five countries representing 150 million workers. For the AFL, silence was beginning to sound like irrelevance. What it wound up saying is less interesting than what the act of saying suggests about the institution at this stage. A generation of leaders and staff whose political notions were formed by Vietnam and the wars in Central America, as opposed to World War II and the cold war, does not guarantee an anti-imperialist or even antiwar perspective. (After September 11 many a unionist with a youthful past in SDS or some socialist groupuscule cheered the bombers on to Afghanistan and vilified those who condemned them.)

But freedom from the ideological straitjacket that constrained their predecessors makes independent analysis, makes changing one's mind, possible in a way it wasn't before. They have no equivalent of Scoop Jackson, the anticommunist Democrat who gave shape and validation to Lane Kirkland's worldview. They trudge in the muck of Democratic politics but find no gurus there, and hardly any champions. Instead, they are nudged by memberships of immigrants, influenced by global relationships and proximity to youth that have had an enormous impact.

As recently as five years ago there weren't too many unionists talking about capitalism and the mechanisms by which big money exerts power to the detriment of workers everywhere. The shift from "Save Our Jobs" and "Buy American" to "Cancel the Debt" and "The World Is Not for Sale" has not been easy or even. Nor has the globalization movement as a whole put the relationship between open markets and military might-capitalism and imperialism-at the forefront of its concerns.

In this context the federation's focus on unilateralism vis-à-vis Iraq seems at once to express a conservative (in the old meaning of the word) calculus and a nascent, still-raggedy internationalism. All of this creates room for more radical currents in labor. The right has nowhere to go. (Even James Hoffa is fed up with Bush.) The center is persuadable. The left has to figure out how to move them-and "move" in a soulful as well as analytical and practical sense. The way is not self-evident. No one can remember when the antiwar position in labor wasn't limited to a beleaguered rebel band. No one knows how thin opposition might be for all its breadth. Does onseet of war change things? What happens if another terrorist attack occurs? Such questions have yet to receive serious, prolonged consideration.

In Italy, Ireland, England, Germany and Australia, unions have promised strikes in the event of war; even before, train operators in Italy and England refused to move arms. On March 10 the San Francisco Labor Council voted unanimously to urge mass job actions on the first day of bombing, but in America there is nothing resembling the capacity of Europe to mobilize members. Here we confront the other face of American labor's weakness, and this one, too, goes back to the same postwar compact labor entered with business and government, promising labor peace and support for cold war imperatives in exchange for a slice of the pie.

Labor leaders trudge in the muck of Democratic politics but find no gurus there, and hardly any champions. Instead, they are nudged by memberships of immigrants, influenced by global relationships and proximity to youth that have had an enormous impact.

What antiwar work has done is begin to break the jam-up in labor thinking on militarism in the same way that the earliest cross-border work did with thinking on capital mobility. In many ways it is politics by resolution, but this is better assessed realizing that, as USLAW reports, many labor bodies say they haven't addressed the question of war because they simply can't fathom it as part of the union's business.

That is changing, and the inconsistency of stances-against military aggression now, against unilateral military aggression ever, against aggression that can't be linked to the war on terrorism, against the war on terrorism, the one without boundaries and without end, and the imperialist order that defines it-reflects the process. From all indications, the AFL-CIO does not intend to push the process further than it has; nor to lean on the Democratic Party to abandon complacency. Word is it doesn't want to add to divisions in the party. Moreover, institutional labor still clings to the notion that it can be restored to is broker role, or at least assistant junior partner, if the Democrats can win in 2004. There is no underestimating the capacity for self-delusion.

Still, history will not be canceled. The contradictions labor faces in the next period will not be resolved even if war on Iraq proceeds and "succeeds" on the terms of its authors. To those contradictions, the Democratic Party offers no solutions. We are in an economy of guns without butter, in which globalization, trade and militarism are linked as surely as "the triple evils" of economic exploitation, racism and war against which Martin Luther King spoke in 1967. If they are to develop, the emerging global peace movement and the emerging global labor movement will have to take up King's call for a "restructuring" of the whole of society.

In this respect, there was something telling in The Wall Street Journal's linkage of Sweeney, France, Russia and Sharpton: not because any of them most nobly represents the aspirations of the working-class, the world, the black community or the peace crowd but because in each instance the only force that gives them relevance is what, for lack of a better term, we have come to call civil society. It seems that only on that stage can America, the world and the true interests of their people be defended against barbarism. CP

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dirty Bombs

BY DAVE LINDORFF

Now that the bombs have started falling on Baghdad, it's time to start worrying about dirty bombs—those weapons of mass destruction we've been hearing so much about. While not nuclear weapons, they can spread radioactive waste all over an area. We're not talking about the remote prospect of a dirty bomb hitting some American city. We're talking about the near certainty that dirty bombs will be going off all over Baghdad, Tikrit and other Iraqi cities, indeed that they probably are already being detonated there, putting at risk Iraqi civilians, including small children, not to mention U.S. troops who will no doubt soon be entering those cities.

The U.S. has been firing off "dirty bombs" in the form of depleted uranium (DU) weapons now since the 1991 Gulf War against Iraq. Depleted uranium, a radioactive metal that is part of the waste stream from nuclear weapons, turns out to be a highly effective armor-piercing material. 1.7 times as dense as lead, and has the unusual property of self-sharpening: as a rod of the stuff slams into a sheet of steel or a wall of reinforced concrete, instead of mushrooming into a flat, broad projectile that then is slowed or stopped by the obstacle, uranium sheds its exterior layers and becomes sharper as it is propelled by momentum deeper and deeper into its target. Uranium is also highly flammable at the kinds of high temperature generated by a high-velocity collision, and so it incinerates whatever target it hits.

In the 1991 Gulf War, depleted uranium was used extensively in two types of weapons—the 120 mm anti-tank shells fired by Abrams tanks and other anti-tank cannons, and the 30 mm anti-armor guns on the A-10 Warthog ground attack jets. An estimated 300 tons of the stuff was fired off in the Iraqi and Kuwaiti desert during that war. In Kosovo, the same weapons were used, this time reportedly a total of about 12 tons, mostly in the form of small 30 mm projectiles fired by aircraft.

In Afghanistan, the Pentagon introduced a third category of uranium weapon—the so-called bunker-busting bomb—a depleted uranium "smart bomb" or missile that can burrow deep into the ground or through thick concrete walls to hit heavily shielded shelters or cave hideouts. The Pentagon has not released information about how much depleted uranium was used in weapons in Afghanistan, but estimates have ranged from several hundred tons to as much as 1000 tons—and this was in conflict that was tiny compared to the likely war in Iraq.

Critics of depleted uranium weapons—and these run from the U.N. World Health Organization to Gulf War veterans groups— charge that the prospect of uranium bunker buster bombs raises the danger of radioactive contamination dramatically, because of where such bombs get used. For the most part, anti-tank weapons, at least to date, have been used where tanks are generally deployed, which is out in the open, where population density is low. Although when a depleted uranium round explodes, the uranium is incinerated, becoming a dangerous aerosol of minute inhalable particles of uranium oxide, out in the desert the risks are relatively low of many people becoming contaminated. Absent a wind, most of that radioactive residue settles within 50-100 yards of the target.

Even so, there are reports from both the Basra area of southern Iraq, where use of depleted uranium shells by British and U.S. forces in 1991 was heavy, and in Afghanistan, of higher than anticipated cancer rates and birth defects. Some suspect that at least some of the cases of what has become known as Gulf War Syndrome among returned U.S. Gulf War veterans is the result of their having inhaled the residue of uranium weapons.

Researchers from a British non-profit organization, the Uranium Medical Research Center (http://www.umrc.net/projectAfghanistan.asp) claim that during an investigation of bombed areas in Kabul and especially Jalalabad, Afghanistan, they encountered widespread evidence of illnesses and birth defects which they said were consistent with uranium poisoning and radioactive contamination. They also reported elevated levels of uranium in the vicinity. They called their findings "shocking". Similar reports have come from the area in southern Iraq where uranium anti-tank weapons were widely used.

But these reports of dirty bomb aftereffects could be dwarfed if, as expected, the U.S. makes significant use of bunker-busting uranium weapons in urban areas of Iraq. For one thing, the amount of uranium vaporized in an explosion would be vastly greater. There are, for example, only about three kilograms of uranium in a 120mm anti-tank round. But the DU explosive charges in the guided bomb systems used in Afghanistan (for example Raytheon's Bunker Buster - GBU-28) reportedly can weigh as much as one and a half metric tons.

The risks of uranium weapons to soldiers and civilians is a topic of some controversy, even among critics, though no one except the Pentagon and NATO disputes that it is a health threat. A government study prepared for Congress in the mid 1990s offered the following assessment of the dangers of the radioactive weapons: "As much as 70 percent of a DU penetrator can be aerosolized when it strikes a tank. Aerosols containing DU oxides may contaminate the area downwind. DU fragments may also contaminate the soil around the struck vehicle." It adds that there are many paths by which the resulting particles may enter the body - by inhalation, ingestion, or through open

SUBSCRIPTION INFO

Enter/Renew Subscription here:

One year $40 Two yrs $70
($35 email only / $45 email/print)
One year institution/supporters $100
One year student/low income, $30
T-shirts, $17
Please send back issue(s)
_____ ($5/issue)

Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

_____

Payment must accompany order, or dial 1-800-840-3683 and renew by credit card. Add $12.50 for Canadian and $17.50 for foreign subscriptions. If you want Counter-Punch emailed to you please supply your email address. Make checks payable to: **CounterPunch**
Business Office
PO Box 228, Petrolia, CA 95558

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wounds. The report then states, "If DU enters the body, it has the potential to generate significant medical consequences. The risks associated with DU in the body are both chemical and radiological." Once inside the lungs or kidneys, uranium particles tend to stay, causing illnesses such as lung cancer and kidney disease that may take decades to show up.

According to Dr. J. W. Gofman, a leading expert and critic of low-level radiation risks, particles of uranium smaller than 5 micron in diameter can become permanently trapped in the lungs. By one estimate, a trapped, single uranium oxide particle of this size could expose the adjacent lung tissue to approximately 1,360 rem per year—about 8,000 times the annual radiation dosage considered safe by federal regulations for whole body exposure. Uranium, which besides being carcinogenic is also highly toxic chemically (like lead or mercury), also concentrates in the kidneys and reproductive organs if ingested orally.

Even Dan Fahey, of the Persian Gulf War Veterans Resource Center, a Navy veteran who has criticized some anti-war organizations' charges concerning the dangers of uranium weapons, says that they were "probably a contributor to Gulf War Syndrome" among returning U.S. Gulf War veterans. Although he debunks as "propaganda and science fiction," thereport by the Uranium Medical Research Center, a U.K.-based organization which claims to have found uranium contamination and signs of radiation-sickness and radiation-induced birth defects in people who live around suspected uranium weapon targets in Kabul and Jalalabad, Afghanistan, Fahey himself is critical of the U.S. military's ever-expanding use of these weapons. In one article he wrote on the subject, he quotes a 1990 Pentagon memo on the health risks of exploded uranium ordinance which concludes that, in order to avoid criticism of the weapons' battlefield use, "we should keep this sensitive issue at mind when after action reports are written." His conclusion, "The military's view is that unless you can prove something is dangerous, we'll keep using it. My view is that given the known health concerns about depleted uranium weapons, unless you can prove it's safe, don't use it."

There is no question about whether or not the US and British are using uranium weapons in the current war against Iraq. Robert Fisk, of the London Independent, quoted a U.S. general on the eve of battle as saying, "We have already begun to unwrap our depleted uranium anti-tank shells." (In the 1991 Gulf War, one in seven Iraqi tanks destroyed by the U.S. was hit by a uranium projectile. This time, the percentage of Iraq's 1800 tanks hit by uranium weapons will be far higher. As for the more serious use of uranium-tipped missiles and bombs, which would be more likely to be used in urban settings, the best evidence is that the Pentagon, absent rules that limit its behavior, will use whatever it has in its arsenal that the generals think work best—and clearly uranium-tipped weapons outperform any alternative in terms of their ability to penetrate armor and other heavy shielding.

According to Pentagon studies, uranium projectiles are at least 10 percent more effective at penetrating shielded bunkers and armor than the next-best alternative—tungsten clad weapons. That alone is a powerful incentive to use them. The Center for Defense Information reports that the patents for America's bunker-busting bombs include both tungsten and uranium-cladded versions, making it clear that these weapons exist in the U.S. military arsenal. Given the Pentagon's public stance that uranium weapons pose no appreciable health risk, it seems clear that these dangerous weapons of mass destruction will be used. Civilians in the future "liberated" Iraq will pay the price for years—maybe generations—to come. CP

A single uranium oxide particle could expose lung tissue to approximately 1,360 rem per year—about 8,000 times the annual dosage considered safe for whole body exposure.

David Lindorff is the author of Killing Time: an Investigation into the Case of Mumia Abu-Jamal.

CounterPunch
PO Box 228
Petrolia, CA 95558

Not Since World War One, Labor's No to War

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED